

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-17, and 24-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13-17, and 31 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner further rejected claims 1-6, 9, 11, 13-15, 24, 25, 27, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Chang et al.* (USP 6,417,884); rejected claims 16, 17, 21, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Scheer* (USP 5,440,449); rejected claims 10, 12, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chang et al.* in view of *Scheer*; rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chang et al.* or *Scheer* in view of *May* (USP 5,043,721); and rejected claims 1-6, 9, 12-15, 24, 25, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Scheer*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In Applicant's Reply filed April 18, 2005, Applicant amended the claims to correct the antecedent error. In the Advisory Action issued June 8, 2005, the Examiner entered the Amendments but did not address the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. Based upon the amendments in Applicant's Reply filed April 18, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – Citing *Chang et al.*

By this Amendment, Applicant respectfully submits a Supplemental Declaration of Prior Invention in a WTO Member Country to Overcome a Cited Patent Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 executed by Takeshi MISAWA as Exhibit 1. This Declaration provides ample evidence establishing invention of the subject matter of the present invention prior to the filing date of August 12, 1998 by *Chang et al.* The Declaration further provides Exhibits A-D that establish proper diligence from just prior to the effective date of *Chang et al.* through the filing of the present application. Based upon this submission, Applicant respectfully submits that *Chang et al.* is not prior art with respect to the present invention. It is respectfully requested that all rejections cited in *Chang et al.* be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) – *Scheer*

The Examiner rejected claim 16 asserting *Scheer* discloses a cutout part citing to Figure 9. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

First, the Examiner is respectfully reminded of a telephone conference conducted with Applicant's representative on discussing the differences between the claimed invention and *Scheer et al.* The parties agreed that *Scheer* fails to teach or suggest wherein the display unit comprises at least one of a cutout part and a transparent part so that whether the external device is inserted in the chamber can be determined by seeing through the at least one of the cutout part and the transparent part. Based upon this agreement, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

For the record, the disclosure of *Scheer* is directed to a wireless communication connector and module for notebook personal computers. The PC includes an I/O connector and the module located at the top of the display screen. The module is L shaped to conform to the shape of the display screen housing with the connector to the internal printed circuit I/O card extending into the notebook PC frame (Abstract). However, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Scheer* that is directed to the display unit comprising at least one of a cutout part and a transparent part so that whether the external device is inserted into the chamber can be determined by seeing through the at least one of the cutout part of the transparent part. Since *Scheer* fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over the reference as cited by the Examiner.

As claim 17 includes elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons noted above with regard to claim 16.

As claims 1 and 13-15 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims, together with claims dependent thereon are allowable for the reasons noted above with regard to claim 16.

Additional Comments

During the telephone interview conducted on May 9, 2005, the Examiner contacted Applicant's representative and indicated that he was in a position to allow the pending application providing that Applicant's agreed to cancel claim 31. As evidenced by the

prosecution history, the Examiner has failed to allow the pending application. As such, Applicant respectfully submits, as the cancellation of claim 31 was contingent upon allowance of the present application, that claim 31 is not cancelled and is currently pending. As there is no proper outstanding rejection against claim 31, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 31 is in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner is in a position to allow the present application after considering this Reply, and there only remains a final issue regarding the patentability of claim 31, Applicant may agree to cancel claim 31 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter included therein.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisin (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorneys for Applicant